

REMARKS

Each of claims 74-79 remains pending in this application, with independent claims 74 and 77. With this response, Applicants amend each of claims 74, 77, and 79. The amendments add no new matter, as the application as originally-filed supports each of the new claims. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

35 U.S.C. § 102/103 Rejections

The office action rejects each of claims 74, 75, 77, and 78 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 20030220123 to Motohashi. The Office action rejects each of 76 and 79 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Motohashi. As amended, each of independent claims 74 and 77 recites, in part, a plurality of wireless microphones each independently portable on a stage by the operators; a wireless receiver operable to wirelessly receive radio signals from the plurality of wireless microphones; a plurality of computers each being connected to the wireless receiver over a Local Area Network (LAN) ***different from the radio signals received by the wireless receiver***; wherein the wireless receiver obtains ***from the radio signals*** and continuously sends over the LAN information indicative of a status of at least one of the plurality of wireless microphones, and wherein ***the status comprises at least one of: an RF level, a VU level, and a battery level***. Motohashi neither discloses nor suggests all of the elements recited by the independent claims and, therefore, cannot anticipate the independent claims or render them obvious.

- I. **Motohashi neither discloses nor suggests a plurality of computers each being connected to a wireless receiver over a LAN different from the radio signals received by the wireless receiver.**

By way of background, the Office action alleges that Motohashi discloses a plurality of “wireless microphones” and a wireless receiver operable to wirelessly receive radio signals from one or more of the plurality of wireless microphones. (See Office action at page 3.) Applicants understand the Office action to allege that each mobile telephone terminal (enclosed in a respective housing 111) corresponds to a “wireless microphone” because: (1) a radio communication function portion 103 of a

terminal disclosed in Motohashi does not receive a radio signal from the voice input portion 107 of the same device; and (2) the voice input portion 107 of the terminal disclosed in Motohashi does not output a radio signal and, therefore, cannot output a radio signal received by a radio communication function portion 103 of another terminal.

Considering the above interpretation of the Office action, the Motohashi cannot disclose or suggest a plurality of computers each being connected to the wireless receiver over **a Local Area Network (LAN) different from the radio signals received by the wireless receiver**. The Office action alleges that the control portion 101 disclosed in Motohashi corresponds to the recited computer. (Office action at pages 3-4.) However, Motohashi does not disclose multiple modes of communication between the terminals – from the radio communication function portion 103 of one terminal to the radio communication function portion 103 of another terminal – and, therefore, cannot disclose or suggest that the control portion 101 disclosed in Motohashi discloses only one mode of communication between the disclosed terminals. Accordingly, Motohashi does not disclose or suggest a plurality of computers each being connected **to the wireless receiver** over a Local Area Network (LAN) **different from the radio signals received by the wireless receiver**, as the claims recite. For at least this reason, Motohashi cannot anticipate these claims (or render them obvious), and Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the independent claims.

II. Motohashi neither discloses nor suggests a wireless receiver that obtains from the received radio signals a status of at least one of the plurality of wireless microphones.

The Office action alleges that Motohashi teaches a wireless receiver obtains and continuously sends over the LAN information indicative of a status of a microphone. With this response, Applicants amend claim 74 to recite wherein the wireless receiver obtains **from the radio signals** and continuously sends over the LAN information indicative of a status of at least one of the plurality of wireless microphones. That is, claim 74 now specifies that the wireless receiver does not obtain **and** send the information indicative of the status over the LAN but, as the

specification makes clear, obtains the information from the radio signals and sends the information over the LAN.

Motohashi does not disclose or suggest the wireless receiver recited by the claim. The Office action alleges that Motohashi discloses the limitation of the unamended claim at figure 1: “the voice input portion [107] is a microphone that converts input voice signals to electrical signals and sends these signals via control portion 101 to radio communication portion 103 for transmission, thus the radio terminal 103 is aware of the status of the voice input portion 107.” Office action at page 4. First, as described above, ***the LAN by which the receiver is connected to the computers is different from the radio signals the receiver receives from the microphones***. Accordingly, while “the radio terminal 103 is aware of the status of the voice input portion 107,” (*Id.*) the radio terminal 103 ***does not obtain the status of the voice input portion 107 from the radio signals***. Second, even if one considers the receiver in one terminal disclosed in Motohashi as receiving signals from a plurality of other terminals – an interpretation with which the Applicants disagree – the receiver does not obtain information indicative of the status of any of those terminals from the radio signals. For at least this additional reason, Motohashi cannot anticipate these claims (or render them obvious), and Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the independent claims.

Each of claims 75, 76, 78, and 79 depends from one of independent claims 74 and 77, patentable over Motohashi for the reasons described above. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that each of claims 75, 76, 78, and 79 is patentable over Motohashi for at least the reasons described above and request reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections.

Additionally, each of amended claims 76 and 79 recites a camera, separated from the wireless microphones, the wireless receiver, and the computers. Motohashi does not disclose a separate camera and, in fact, would cease to function as a “mobile telephone terminal having television telephone function” if the camera were separated from the wireless microphones, the wireless receiver, and the computers alleged by the Office action. Thus, for yet this additional reason, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 76 and 79 are patentable over Motohashi, and request reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, all remaining claims are in condition for allowance for the reasons provided above. Applicants submit this response with a Request for Continued Examination, a Petition for a One-Month Extension of Time, and the required fees, extending the date for response to July 16, 2010. Although Applicants believe that no additional fees or petitions are due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 13-2855 of Marshall, Gerstein & Borun, LLP under Order No. 19036/41594.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 8, 2010

By: 

Jeremy D. Protas

Registration No.: 61,681

MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP

233 S. Wacker Drive, Suite 6300

Willis Tower

Chicago, Illinois 60606-6357

(312) 474-6300

Attorney for Applicants